



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE ORIGIN OF ROMAN SATIRE

BY ROBERT HENNING WEBB

The question raised in the title of this paper was a disputed point of literary history as early as the time of Suetonius, and anyone who has followed the extensive researches which modern scholarship has devoted to its solution, must feel convinced that no line of investigation has been left untried, and that practically every interpretation of the facts at our disposal has already been made. My excuse in venturing to discuss the subject further is my belief in the necessity of recapitulating these same facts in view of some recently published theories which come dangerously near disregarding them. For there is much to be said in favor of returning to the simple old-fashioned view that what we call Roman satire took its rise from a crude dramatic performance called *satura*, which was popular in Rome before the appearance of literary and artistic comedy. The brilliance and ingenuity of the arguments which have been directed against this view do not, in my opinion, impair its value, and I shall try to show that the orthodox position offers after all the most satisfactory and reasonable explanation of the facts.

Our knowledge of the existence of a dramatic *satura* we owe to Livy vii. 2.¹ Livy's account was accepted at its face value until 1867, when Otto Jahn pointed out² the aetiological character of the passage, and claimed that the whole description was nothing more than the résumé of a "combination" invented by some scholar, such as Varro, who was interested in the history of literature. This hint was taken up by Leo and Hendrickson and worked out in the course of four articles,³ with substantially the following results: A

¹ I do not take into account the *futilia commenta* (so Marx *Lucilius* I, p. xii) of Euanthius (see Wessner *Donatus* I, 16 f.). The statement of Valerius Maximus ii. 4. 4. is very similar to that of Livy, and is generally assumed to be a mere paraphrase of Livy. But cf. below, p. 179.

² *Hermes* II, 225-26.

³ Leo: "Varro und die Satire" *Hermes* XXIV (1889), 67-84; "Livius und Horaz über die Vorgeschichte des römischen Dramas" *Hermes* XXXIX (1904), 63-77. Hendrickson: "The Dramatic Satura and the Old Comedy at Rome" *AJP* XV (1894), 1-30; "A Pre-Varronian Chapter of Roman Literary History" *AJP* XIX (1898), 285-311.

comparison of the Livy passage with Horace *Epistles* ii. 1. 139-60 (*Agricolae prisci fortes parvoque beati*, etc.) shows that both Livy and Horace are reproducing, either directly or indirectly,¹ the theories of some ancient grammarian, who applied to Roman literary history the methods of the Peripatetics, and, desiring to supply with a Roman parallel each step in Aristotle's account of the rise of Greek drama, deliberately fabricated the *satura* as a phenomenon to offset the old Attic comedy.²

Against this theory Charles Knapp in *PAPA* XL (1909), p. lii, outlines an argument which he offers as the introduction to a more exhaustive treatment of the subject. The parallelism between Livy and Horace, he claims, is far from complete, and neither account agrees in detail with Aristotle or with any one of the treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας*. But however close may be considered the resemblance between the Roman and the Greek accounts, this resemblance may be due to the fact that the germs of the drama actually did develop among these two related peoples in a similar way; or else we may suppose that the Roman writer desired, without in any way distorting the truth, so to arrange the data at his disposal that they should in the main agree with Aristotle.³

Both these objections seem to me well taken. But suppose we accept without question the hypothesis of Leo and Hendrickson, and carry it to its logical conclusion. The question naturally suggests itself: from what source did the author of the "construction" get the name *satura* for his manufactured dramatic product? Obviously, from the literary satire of Ennius (Leo) or Lucilius (Hendrickson). But we have had no conclusive evidence that *satura* was the title employed by these early writers, and it was long ago observed that the first occurrence of the word as applied to the literary

¹ Leo and Hendrickson agree that Varro is not responsible for either account, and that the source of Horace, at least, is pre-Varronian. Hendrickson maintains the common source to be Accius's *Didascalica*. Leo, while not agreeing that Livy and Horace used an identical source, believes that both writers are immediately beholden to the annalists.

² For the principle of parallelism, Elmore, equally skeptical, substitutes with less plausibility the principle of "duplication."—"Livy's Account of the Dramatic *Satura*" *PAPA* XXXIV (1903), pp. lxvii f.

³ Cf. also Ferdinando de Paola *Le origini della satira romana*, Città di Castello 1909, p. 15.

form is in Horace *Serm.* ii. 1. 1. In solution of this difficulty we have the last word of the skeptics presented in the April number of *Classical Philology* for 1911. There Hendrickson argues cleverly to show that the genesis of the word *satura* as a current literary term occurred in the decade from 40 to 30 B.C., between the publication of the first and the second books of Horace's satires. Livy's authority, therefore, left nameless the phenomenon with which he paralleled old comedy, and the historian himself inserted into his text the new term which was just becoming popular in literary circles.

I have already observed that the account of Valerius Maximus has been generally believed to possess no independent value. That it is, however, not a mere paraphrase of Livy, but derived from the same source which Livy employed, is the contention of a monograph by Julius Orendi.¹ His arguments I cannot here discuss. At any rate his thesis is plausible; and since Valerius, as well as Livy, uses the word *satura*, Orendi's theory should certainly be refuted before the statement is hazarded that this word is an innovation due to Livy himself.

Moreover, apart from the question of Livy's source, can we be sure that *satura* as a literary term was not used before Livy? In the celebrated and much discussed passage in his *περὶ ποιημάτων* (*G.L.* i. 485), Diomedes, who is following Suetonius, offers several possible etymologies of *satura*, and for the third of these quotes Varro as his authority. I agree with Hendrickson² that Jahn³ and Leo⁴ are not justified in referring the whole statement of Diomedes to Varro's authorship. But on the other hand, there is as little basis for the conjecture of Hendrickson that Varro, in the passage which Diomedes quotes, is not discussing the technical meaning of *satura*, but is merely explaining the popular phrase *per saturam*. Diomedes writes: "Sive a quodam genere farciminis, quod multis rebus refertum saturam dicit Varro vocitatum. Est autem hoc positum in secundo libro Plautinarum Quaestionum: *satura est uva passa et polenta et nuclei pini ex mulso consparsa.*" "That the

¹ "M. Terentius Varro, die Quelle zu Livius vii. 2" *Programm Bistritz*, 1891. The situation will of course not be altered, so far as our point is concerned, if for Orendi's "Varro" we substitute Hendrickson's "pre-Varronian."

² *Class Phil.* VI, 136.

³ *Rhein Mus.* IX, 629.

⁴ *Hermes* XXIV.

Plautine Questions would scarcely afford occasion to consider *satura* as the name of a form of literature need not be said."¹ But the language of Diomedes implies that Varro discussed the matter elsewhere than in this particular work. If *autem* means anything at all, it means that the writer is thus introducing an additional citation from Varro. In the Plautine Questions Varro gives the recipe for the "stuffing," and in some other work he offers the etymology *a quodam genere farciminis*. As to the Plautus passage upon which the great scholar is commenting, the conjecture of Marx² is as good as any other: *saturam* in *Amph.* 667. In what connection Varro elsewhere discussed the word, we have no means of ascertaining, but we certainly cannot deny that he may have discussed it as a literary term, especially in view of the fact that it is this aspect of the word with which Suetonius is concerned. Such a discussion might easily find a place, for example, in the *De compositione saturarum*.³ What more likely than that Varro, himself a writer of satires, should set forth, possibly as an introduction to the *Menippeae*, the *provenance* of the literary term?

This raises a question which offers a still more serious objection to the acceptance of Hendrickson's theory—namely, the titles of Varro's own satirical productions. If we accept the cogent reasoning of Klotz in *Hermes* XLVI (1911), 1-46,⁴ Jerome's catalogue of Varro's writings was based on a similar list drawn up by Varro himself in the introduction to his *Imagines*. In this list the word *satura* occurs twice: No. 35, *satirarum Menippearum libri cl*, and No. 39, *satirarum libri iiii*. Unless, therefore, we can suppose that in two instances Jerome capriciously changed the wording of the titles as they came from Varro's own hand, we are forced to the conclusion that Varro himself called these works *saturae*.

To the members of Horace's circle, then, the term *satura* was no novelty. The fact that it does not appear in extant literature of

¹ Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

² *Lucilius Proleg.*, p. xi.

³ Cited by Nonius 67. 16. Bücheler *Petronius*,⁴ p. 188, has no warrant for identifying this work with the Menippean satire *Κυνοδιδασκαλικά*. Klotz (*Hermes* XLVI, 16) suggests that it may be one of Varro's *libri singulares x* (i.e., *μονόβιβλοι*).

⁴ Hendrickson refers to this paper in a note at the end of his article, adding: "The questions raised by the Varronian titles had not escaped me, but their consideration becomes all the more pressing if in fact they are from Varro's own hand."

an earlier date, even in connections where such a term is clearly needed, may be easily explained. All the passages in which Hendrickson finds the absence of the word most surprising have to do with the work of Lucilius. Now if not only the Menippeans of Varro, but also, as seems highly probable,¹ the "Miscellany Poems" of Ennius and Pacuvius, were called *saturae*, a more accurate description would undoubtedly be needed for specific reference to the new polemic satire of the *character Lucilianus*. Especially would this be true if Lucilius actually employed a different title, such as the *sermones per saturam* of Marx's conjecture. But to these round-about designations of the Lucilian style to which Cicero and Horace have recourse, there must, in the natural course of events, be a limit. This limit is reached at the beginning of Horace's second book, and his *Sunt quibus in satura* marks, not, as Hendrickson would have us believe, the "genesis of a literary form," but only the new and wider application of a long-familiar term.² Henceforth, while *satura* is broad enough to include the Varronian Petronius, as well as the Horatian Persius and the ultra-Lucilian Juvenal, yet the aggressive style of Lucilius and Horace is satire *par excellence*. So it comes about that for Quintilian, Ennius is a nonentity, and Varro only an afterthought, as the author of *alterum illud prius genus*.

But the soundness or weakness of Hendrickson's theory as to the history of the word does not materially affect the problem raised by the main contention of the skeptics. Whatever date be assigned for the genesis of *satura*, the question remains: from what source was the word taken for use as a literary term? Their answer is: from the popular phrase *per saturam*, meaning "irregularly," "indiscriminately," "*en masse*."

¹ Cf. below, p. 188.

² It seems futile to conjecture whether any single term was used to designate the literary genus of Lucilius and Horace before their work came to be generally known as "satire." The *comoedia* and the *ludus* of Hendrickson (*Class. Philol.* VI, 133, n.) would not be sufficiently distinctive. Horace himself twice uses *ludere* in reference to lyric poetry (*Carm.* i. 32. 2, and iv. 9. 9) and once in reference to the drama (*Epp.* ii. 1. 148). The same objection may, in the absence of any conclusive evidence, be raised against the *schedium* of Ingersoll (*Class. Philol.* VII, 59-65), a word which designates rather a style or manner (i.e. "affected extemporization") than a literary genus. Surely Horace's own *sermones* would serve for a type-name as well as any of these suggested substitutes.

Now the deliberate coinage of a noun from this adverbial phrase would be, to say the least, very strange, and, so far as I know, without precedent. Besides, we have still to account for the origin of the phrase itself. It is one which cannot be lightly disposed of, for it is deeply embedded in the language, occurring in a fragment of Lucilius, quoted by Verrius from an oration delivered by T. Annius Luscus against Ti. Gracchus, and traditional in the Augustan age as a legal formula of uncertain antiquity. It was not understood by the early grammarians, and the expressions *lex satura* and *lanx satura*, which Diomedes offers as explanations of *saturation* as a literary term, may be nothing more than attempts to account for *per saturation*.¹ But assuming, with the skeptics, that the ancient explanations are forgeries, what is the origin of the phrase? They have no answer. "What *saturation* in the phrase *per saturation* is we do not know any better than the ancients did, nor are we likely to find out."² If so, then the whole problem of the origin of satire is insoluble, and we are no better off than we were at the outset. Are we wise, therefore, to discredit that source of information which offers the most reasonable explanation of the difficulty? I mean the statement of Livy. *Per saturation*, "miscellaneously," naturally arose from a noun *saturation*, "miscellany," and such a noun Livy gives us as the name of a dramatic medley. It is to be observed that Livy's testimony demands all the more consideration because it is in a measure indirect. Livy is not attempting to account for the origin either of *per saturation* or of literary satire. He merely mentions *saturation* as one step in the development of the drama at Rome.

But a closer examination of this crucial passage may enable us to form a truer estimate of its trustworthiness. At the beginning of chap. ii of Book vii, Livy tells of an epidemic which arose in the year 364 B.C. and made great havoc, in spite of various attempts on the part of the state officials to appease the anger of the gods. Finally, as a last resort, a decree was passed recommending the institution of *ludi scaenici*, and players were summoned from Etruria. The author then proceeds to distinguish four stages in the development of the drama from these beginnings until the appearance of

¹ Cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.* VI, 139 f.

² Hendrickson *ibid.*, p. 139.

real artistic comedy: (1) The Etrurian actors danced, without song or pantomime, to the accompaniment of the flute. (2) The Romans themselves took up the fashion, adding to the Etruscan dance an improvised comic dialogue, and adapting the movements of the dance to the words. (3) Soon we find professional Roman actors presenting *saturae*, the text of which consisted no longer of rude dialogue in the Fescennine manner, but of songs written to the music of the flute. (4) Finally appeared Livius Andronicus, who constructed a play with a unifying plot. Some time afterward, the primitive style of dialogue described in the second stage was revived by amateurs, as an *exodium*, and performed usually in connection with the *Atellanae*.¹

Now I do not wish to maintain that Livy is giving us a thoroughly reliable account of the rise of comedy at Rome. No one but an ancient historian would dare trace, in such detail and through such well-marked stages of development, a pre-literary phenomenon. The particular position, for instance, accorded the *saturae* may have no foundation in actual fact. Moreover, whether Livy's source be Varro or someone before Varro, and whether his source be identical with that employed by Horace, are questions immaterial to the point at issue. I would even grant that the account before us may be influenced by Aristotle. But whatever is artificial in the passage, the word *saturae* seems to me to be genuine.

Impletas modis saturae; says Livy. This phrase is one which can scarcely fail to strike the casual reader as queer and forced. Its very meaning is far from clear. The translation "metrical throughout" is a possible one, but affords no contrast with the metrical dialogue which the *saturae* replaced. Taken by itself, the phrase would most naturally be interpreted to mean, "containing a variety of measures." But again we lack a satisfactory antithesis. The context shows that Livy thinks of the *saturae*, not as less monotonous, but as less irregular and formless, than the previous style of entertainment.² The *Fescennino versu similem* he describes as *incompositum ac rudem*; the *saturae*, on the other hand, were pre-

¹ I adopt here Leo's interpretation of the phrase *consertaque fabellis potissimum Atellanis*: *Hermes* XXXIX, p. 68 and n. 1.

² So Hendrickson *AJP* XV, 12.

sented *descripto ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti*. But without the context we should get no hint of this meaning from *impletas modis*.¹ Why then does Livy employ this obscure description, the absence of which would greatly clarify the passage? Because he is attempting to explain the etymology of the noun *saturae*.² The adjective *satur*, in its extensive use throughout Latin literature, in figurative as well as literal senses, always means "full." A *satura* would be a "full" performance. Full of what? *Impletas modis*.

Livy's fondness for originating or perpetuating³ verbal explanations of this kind is too well known to need any illustration here. In fact we have another instance of it in this same passage: the word *histrion*, he notes, is derived from the Etruscan *hister*. We are also familiar with his offhand way of introducing these explanations, seldom labeling them as etymologies unless he is combating a tradition, as, for example, in the case of *Servius* and *pomerium* in Book i. In the passage before us his object is attained by placing the etymological phrase in the most emphatic position. We should expect *saturas* to begin the sentence, as the name of a new style of exhibition, marking an advance upon the old, and Livy's peculiar order of words has not failed to strike the commentators. Indeed Nettleship⁴ and Friedrich⁵ are led to believe that Livy would make the term *saturas* applicable to the preceding stage of development also. But surely Livy does not wish to say that the improvised dialogue of the *iuventus* combined with the Etruscan dance, constituted a kind of *saturae*, and that these were followed by *impletae modis saturae*. This would merely blur the lines of demarkation which it seems the object of the passage to bring out as clearly as possible. The true explanation is, I think, that Livy is employing here the same verbal trick which may be observed below, when he

¹ Valerius Maximus, indeed, misses the point entirely and says, *ludicra ars ad saturarum modos perrepsit*.

² I am gratified to find that this conclusion, which I reached independently, is corroborated by Heinrich (*Juvenal* [1839] Vol. II, Introd., p. 5.), and by Birt ("Zwei politische Satiren des alten Rom" [1888] p. 17, n. 2). Neither of these scholars elaborates the idea, or draws any inference therefrom.

³ I make no attempt in this discussion to distinguish between Livy and his source. Such a distinction is negligible, so far as my argument is concerned.

⁴ *The Roman Satura*, Oxford, 1878, p. 4.

⁵ *Zur Geschichte der römischen Satire*, Schweidnitz, 1899, p. 7.

says that Andronicus was the first *argumento fabulam serere*. The writer does not here imply¹ that the preceding *saturae* were *fabulae* also, and that Andronicus made a new kind of *fabula*. Livy conceives of the word *fabula* as applicable only to describe a performance with a plot, of which the disconnected *saturae* had none, and he shows that this is his meaning by the position of *argumento*. The plot is the distinctive element in a play with a story, and so above, variety of content is what distinguishes the *saturae*.

But of course the presence of this etymological explanation would not necessarily prove that the word *saturae* was not, as the skeptics claim, a term fabricated to supply a missing link in the evolution of the drama. Indeed it might be maintained that the etymology was introduced expressly for the purpose of lending plausibility to an imported term. But that such was not the case is indicated by the tone of the passage as a whole. There is no evidence of a tendency on the writer's part to use technical language or to assign a distinct name to each of the phenomena he describes. Even where he has such a term ready to his hand, he refrains from employing it: we find no mention of the *palliata* in connection with the activity of Livius Andronicus. And there is certainly nothing to show that the writer would fabricate a generic term outright. On the contrary, we have clear evidence of his honesty. Before the *saturae* came a stage to which he gives no definite name. He describes it in various ways: *inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus; Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant*; and finally *ridicula intexta versibus iactitare*.² The writer evidently conceives of this stage as consisting of something like Fescennines, but without a name of its own. If, however, he were an unscrupulous critic, bent solely upon finding a definite Roman parallel for each step in the growth of Greek comedy, what would have been simpler than to call the performance *Fescennini* once for all, and avoid the cumbrous paraphrases? He is clearly honest here, and yet we are asked to believe that he is romancing

¹ Yet Hendrickson so interprets the phrase *AJP* XV, p. 13, n. 1.

² Cf. Hendrickson *AJP* XV, p. 9, n. 1. "The effort to give variety to the same description in these three places will scarcely escape the attentive reader, e.g., *fundentes, iaciebant, iactitare: inter se, alternis, inter se: iocularia, Fescennino versu similem, ridicula.*"

when he says the third stage consisted of *saturae*. If he is romancing, he might at least have done it more cleverly. For the Atellan farce is mentioned below, entirely out of line with his careful sketch and with the Aristotelian scheme. Why does he not identify the *Atellana* with the third stage, thus at one stroke providing logically for the *Atellana*, and avoiding the necessity of creating a new term? The manipulation of facts necessary to this transposition would surely not tax too severely the conscience of the author of a literary-historical "combination."

So, then, we reach this alternative: the writer is either incumbering and obscuring his text with a counterfeit term which he does not need, or else he is honestly using the traditional name of a primitive form of comedy, attempting at the same time to help the reader understand the obsolescent meaning of the word by introducing its etymology.

There was, therefore, if my reasoning is correct, a dramatic *satura*. Just what it was, we have no means of knowing. We have seen that the author of Livy's account, with his predilection for etymology, and his anxiety for logical precision in distinguishing clearly the various stages of dramatic development, was forced to keep *satura* and *fabula* apart. But it is probable that, on the analogy of *palliata*, *togata*, etc., we should supply this noun in order to account for the substantive use of the adjective.¹ *Fabula satura*, and afterward by abbreviation *satura* alone, would mean a "full play," full, not so much of metres, as Livy has it, but rather perhaps of various

¹ Of course no one can with confidence deny the existence of the *genus farciminis* which Varro gives us, perhaps to explain the origin of the literary term (cf. above, p. 180). Its non-occurrence in extant literature is of course against it, and the high authority of Varro alone makes Hendrickson (*Class. Phil.* VI, 140) hesitate to remand it to the same limbo in which Marx has apparently buried *lex satura* and *lanx satura*. But even if this noun existed, we should have no good reason, in the face of Livy's evidence, to discard the dramatic *satura*. Both meanings of the word could exist side by side, even in early times, and it is quite possible that the name of a popular entertainment should be taken directly from a noun familiar in everyday language. Epicharmus, so Athenaeus tells us, wrote a play called *ῥῥῶα*: cf. Dieterich *Pulchinella*, p. 79, n. 1. See other interesting parallels adduced by the same writer on p. 75, and add the *olio* (from Spanish *olla*) of the American "burlesque."

Moreover, we have nothing to show that Varro himself did not mention dramatic *satura*. On the contrary, it is conceivable that he traced literary satire, through the dramatic, back to his *genus farciminis*, and that Suetonius, passing over this intermediate step, merely quotes Varro's ultimate derivation of the term.

subjects and scenes. The transition from the idea of fulness to that of variety is not a violent one, and we seem to have analogies, as has often been observed, in the Italian *farsa* and the French *farce*.

Finally, admitting the existence of dramatic *satura*, it is inconceivable that anyone should refuse to allow a direct connection between this and literary satire. It is true that we have no ancient statement as a warrant for such connection, but how otherwise can we explain the identity of name? Moreover, literary satire is full of traits which suggest dramatic origin, as Hopkins has clearly shown by his admirable summary.¹ This is of course freely granted by the skeptics,² who claim that it was the recognition of this very fact on the part of the ancients which inspired their use of the word as the name of an imagined form of the drama. Surely it is a more natural inference to suppose that literary satire is dramatic for the simple reason that it was the offspring of a phase of dramatic entertainment.

After all, is the gulf between the dramatic and the literary form so great? Suppose that Ennius, tired of Greek tragedy and Roman epic, wished to talk freely and discursively to his contemporaries on current events. Comedy, since the year of his birth, had been a victim to the new fashion of the *palliata*. But the spirit of old comedy had survived certainly into Ennius's youth in the Italian medley of dance and song and *Fescennina licentia*, and it may be that in the few lines of the *Satura* of Naevius³ that have come down to us, we possess relics of an attempt made by a great poet and patriot

¹ "Dramatic *Satura* in Relation to Book *Satura* and the *Fabula Togata*," *PAPA XXXI* (1900), pp. 1 f.

² Cf. Hendrickson *AJP* XV, p. 11, n. 2. "The dramatic element in Lucilius was very pronounced, nor does he seem to have been without a consciousness of it."

In *Class Phil.* VI, p. 134, n., the same writer goes so far as to claim that when Hor. says, *haec ego ludo*, etc., (*S. i.* 10. 37 ff.), he "is at pains to state definitely that his own satirical writings are not meant for the stage." It would be strange indeed if any of Horace's circle of readers needed such a reminder. He is merely giving voice to a modest disclaimer, such as he will later make the burden of his lyric address to M. Agrippa. There he leaves to Varius the field of the epic. Here he declares himself to be equally weak in the field of the drama. Satire is his forte: *Hoc erat . . . melius quod scribere possem, Inventore minor*.

³ A dramatic *satura* according to Friedrich *op cit.*, p. 8. Cf. also de Paola *op. cit.*, pp. 25 f. At any rate the fragments point to a composition of a dramatic nature, and Baehrens *Jahrb.* CXXXIII (1886), 404, and Leo *Hermes* XXXIX, p. 76, n. 3, are alone in denying that we have here the title of a play.

to develop into a true native comedy the splendid dramatic possibilities inherent in this early farce. But the experience of this "Aristophanes of Rome" had been far from pleasant, and Ennius, even had he been willing to emulate his predecessor's failure, was not an Aristophanes. Why not, however, transform into poetry for the reading public something of the frankness and freedom¹ and miscellaneous character, of the dramatic product? And why not give his creation a name, which, by recalling the old title, shall serve to indicate the descent and the nature of the new γένος?

It is entirely beside the point to discuss in this connection Greek influence on Roman satire in general and on Ennius in particular. That influence is well enough attested without supposing that the *Euhemerus* and the *Sota* and the *Hedyphagetica*, etc., are part of the satires of Ennius. Horace admits that Lucilius is a lineal descendant of Eupolis and Cratinus, and surely Quintilian does not wish to claim by his *tota nostra* that the Romans had a monopoly of satiric instinct. But none the less, the *carmen*, that particular form of poetic literature under discussion, is what Horace calls it, *intactum Graecis*.

The remains of the satires of Ennius are too scanty to warrant any certainty as to their original contents. But so far as we can judge, they were just what we should expect them to be, if they took their rise from dramatic *satura*. We find a medley of metres and of subjects. The tone varies between the personal, humorous, colloquial, satiric, and the didactic, ethical, patriotic. In germ at least, the fragments contain all the essential characteristics of literary satire. It is true that Lucilius first gave preponderance to invective, and that he likewise fixed the final metrical form of satire. But on the other hand, the idea of medley, as an element of secondary

¹ It is difficult to understand why Leo (*Hermes* XXXIX, 77) maintains against Hendrickson that the *satura*, as Livy depicts it, has no "polemical character." For the essence of the Fescennines is good-natured raillery, and the only difference Livy brings out between the Fescennine-like performance and the *saturae* is one, not of spirit, but of form. In fact Livy describes the *saturae* by the words *risu ac soluto ioco* (cf. Hendrickson *AJP* XV, 13), and the verbs he uses in connection with the Fescennine style of entertainment—*iacere*, *iactare*, *iactilare* certainly suggest, on the analogy of *iambus*, *λάττειν*, the idea of invective (so Fr. Rausch *Ueber das Verhältniss zwischen Exodium und Atellane auf Grund von Livius vii. 2. 11*, Wien, 1878, p. 7: quoted by Orendi, *op. cit.*, p. 35, n. 1).

importance, persists even as late as the *farrago* of Juvenal. Were it not, therefore, for the fact that Horace is engaged in special pleading against the fanatics of the Lucilius cult, and is on that account anxious to strengthen his case by granting his opponents as much as he can, we should find it difficult to understand why he accords Lucilius the title of *inventor*, and either passes over altogether the father of Roman satire, or else refers to him in such obscure terms that the compliment is worthless.

In conclusion, I may summarize the situation thus: Against the dramatic origin of Roman satire stands the fact that the existence of a dramatic *satura* is ignored by ancient critics, including Horace, Quintilian, Diomedes, and his sources Suetonius, Verrius, and possibly Varro; and is attested by Livy alone in a passage which has been violently and in some measure successfully assailed. On the other hand, I urge: first, that those who doubt the existence of dramatic *satura* become involved in difficulties which cannot be solved by any other facts that they have adduced; second, that Livy's statement bears strong internal evidence of truthfulness, at least so far as the *satura* itself is concerned; third, that the essential elements of Roman satire, as embodied in Ennius, seem a natural outgrowth of a native drama, transmuted by pressure of circumstances, and by the genius of a poet, into a new literary form.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY